

This notice was posted on SEP - 6 2007  
and will remain posted for a period of thirty days  
until: 10/30/2007.



JANICE ATKINSON, Co. Clerk

BY: C. FARIAS  
DEPUTY CLERK

### Kerry Ranch

2181, 2191 & 2193 Francisco Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA (Sonoma County)  
Assessor's Parcel Nos. 034-041-012, 034-022-001 & 002

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Lead Agency:

City of Santa Rosa  
Community Development Department  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Rm. 3 (P.O. Box 1678)  
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-1678

Contact: Gillian Hayes, Planner

Date: September 11, 2007

developing consistent with annexations NWSR 8-87 annexed in 2000 and NWSR 3-07 annexed in 2005. The Kerry Ranch project site is part of the earlier annexation.

#### Environmental Issues:

Per Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines, Kerry Ranch is consistent with the development density established by the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan, including its provisions encouraging the inclusion of second dwelling units on single family residential lots in accordance with the City's second dwelling unit ordinance. Kerry Ranch is consistent with all provisions of the City's second unit ordinance. Thus, Kerry Ranch is consistent with density specifically anticipated by the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and requires no further environmental review other than that related to effects that:

- are peculiar to the project or site;
- were not analyzed as significant in the prior General Plan Final EIR;
- are potential significant off-site or cumulative impacts not discussed in the General Plan EIR; or
- are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the General Plan EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior General Plan EIR.

The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts in site-related Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Geology/Soils, all of which are mitigated to less than significant levels. The following Initial Study consequently finds no significant site related effects from Kerry Ranch. Cumulative environmental impacts and changes related to Kerry Ranch and any other development consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan is evaluated in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final EIR certified June 18, 2002. No significant and unavoidable impacts or changes different from those identified in the General Plan 2020 Final EIR have been identified. Cumulative traffic impacts on Highway 101 and certain street segments were found to be significant and unavoidable in the earlier General Plan Final EIR. No significant impacts or changes peculiar to the Kerry Ranch project or site have been identified in the project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The above listed project-specific potentially significant impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of recommended mitigation measures or through compliance with existing Municipal Code requirements or City standards. Recommended measures are summarized in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) and Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document has been prepared in consultation with local, and state responsible and trustee agencies and in accordance with Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Furthermore, the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration will serve as the environmental compliance document required under CEQA for any subsequent phases of the project and for permits/approvals required by a responsible agency.

---

A 30-day (thirty-day) public review period shall commence on day of week, September 11, 2007. Written comments must be sent to the City of Santa Rosa, Community Development Department, Planning Division, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3, Santa Rosa CA 95402 by October 11, 2007. The City of Santa Rosa Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and project merits on October 11, 2007 in the Santa Rosa City Council Chambers at City Hall (address listed above). Correspondence and comments can be delivered to Gillian Hayes, project planner, phone: (707) 543-4348 email: [GHayes@srcity.org](mailto:GHayes@srcity.org)

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring / Reporting Action & Schedule	Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity	Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
V.A. Compliance with mitigation of the ASI reports that a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted, if archaeological indicators are uncovered during project development. Work shall be stopped at the location of the discovery until the archaeologist completes a significance evaluation. If deemed necessary by the archaeologist, further work in the discovery area shall be monitored by an archaeologist.	Condition of Project approval agreed to by applicant as mitigation measure made a part of the project	Construction manager and City staff inspecting project during construction	Ongoing by project management and City construction inspectors	Final Map not approved until compliance; stop work action if non-compliance during construction	
<b>VI. GEOLOGY/SOILS</b>					
VI. A. Compliance with Final DAC Report	Condition of Project approval agreed to by applicant as mitigation measure made a part of the project	City departments reviewing improvement and building plans	Improvement plans and other guarantees at time of Final Map and prior to issuance of building permits	Final Map not approved until compliance; stop work action if non-compliance during construction	
VI. B. Compliance with all recommendations of the Kleinfelder and ENGEO Geotechnical Reports prepared for the project	Condition of Project approval agreed to by applicant as mitigation measure made a part of the project	City departments reviewing improvement and building plans	Improvement plans and other guarantees at time of Final Map and prior to issuance of building permits	Final Map not approved until compliance; stop work action if non-compliance during construction	

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring / Reporting Action & Schedule	Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity	Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> VIII. A. Compliance with Final DAC report	Condition of Project approval agreed to by applicant as mitigation measure made a part of the project	City departments reviewing improvement and building plans	Improvement plans and other guarantees at time of Final Map and prior to issuance of building permits	Final Map not approved until compliance; stop work action if non-compliance during construction	
VIII. B. Compliance with RWQCB conditions	RWQCB Permit issuance	RWQCB staff	Applicant reports to RWQCB at time of construction	Per RWQCB enforcement	

The project proposes a development of 95 single-family residences with 42 second dwelling units. Project density would be 6.5 dwelling units (d.u.) per acre in keeping with the General Plan designated density range of 2 to 8 d.u. per acre. The proposed project is comprised of three contiguous subdivisions, Kerry Ranch 1, 2 and 3. Kerry Ranch 1 at the corner of San Miguel and Francisco Avenues is 3.95 acres that would be developed with twenty-five (25) single-family dwellings, twelve (12) of which would have second units. The smallest lot would be 4,040 square feet, with the largest being 6,632 square feet. The average lot size is 4,754 square feet. Lot widths vary from 49 to 69 feet. There would be six (6) different unit types, each with three different architectural finishes. The Kerry Ranch 1 site would be somewhat expanded in size as a result of City standard street frontages that would reduce the existing public right-of-way at the corner of Francisco Avenue and San Miguel Avenue.

Kerry Ranch 2 to the north at 2191 Francisco Avenue is 5.24 acres that would be subdivided into thirty-five (35) single-family dwellings, with fourteen (14) second units. The smallest lot would be 3,590 square feet, with the largest being 6,089 square feet. The average lot size is 4,878 square feet. Lots vary in width from 49 to 69 feet. There would be eight (8) different unit types, each with three different architectural finishes.

Kerry Ranch 3 at 2193 Francisco Avenue is 5.25 acres, the northern most of these three subdivisions comprising the Kerry Ranch project. The site would be developed as thirty-five (35) single-family residences, with sixteen (16) second units. The smallest lot would be 4,003 square feet, and the largest would be 6,755 square feet, for an average lot size of 4,889 square feet. Lots vary in width from 45 to 69 feet in width. There would be 8 unit types, each with three different architectural finishes.

The largest lots in all three subdivisions comprising the Kerry Ranch project are typically at corners to enhance streetscapes at intersections. Kerry Ranch 2 and 3 each have three 4-lot courtyard clusters. Additionally, the project architect has devised a 3-lot cluster with two outer lots that wrap around the back of a wide lot in the middle. Kerry Ranch 1 and 3 each have one of those 3-lot clusters, with Kerry Ranch 2 having two of them. Those clusters were designed to provide the internal streetscape with greater variation than would otherwise be the case. Minimum front setbacks include 6 feet for porches, 10 feet for residences, and 19 feet for garages. Rear setbacks are at least 15 feet for residences and 4 feet for rear yard garages. Interior setbacks are at least 8 feet for two-story elements and 4 feet for one-story elements, while exterior side yards are at least 10 feet.

Phasing of Kerry Ranch would proceed from south to north in numerical order of the three subdivisions comprising the overall project. Kerry Ranch 1 and then Kerry Ranch 2 would be designed so they could be free-standing on an interim basis until the next subdivision is constructed.

Off-site improvements are limited to frontage improvements within existing public rights-of-way and an interim pathway the applicant proposes to fund and construct on non-Kerry Ranch properties along the west side of Francisco Avenue up to the crossing to the Jack London school entrance on Francisco Avenue. On site along the west side of Street "C" in Kerry Ranch 1 and 2, there would be 10-feet available for a multi-purpose pedestrian and bicycle path that could link with other segments to the north being considered by the City for improved circulation to/from the Jack London school site.

As noted above, the existing large radius curve in the northwest corner of San Miguel and Francisco Avenues would be modified to conform to City standards for such urban intersections. Consequently, some existing public right-of-way would be abandoned and become part of Kerry Ranch 1. On-site in the southwest corner of Kerry Ranch I is a detention pond, sized to handle run-off from all three subdivisions comprising the Kerry Ranch project.

The pond perimeter would be heavily landscaped so the area is attractive for nearby residences. Additionally, the pond design has been modified by the applicant in response to neighbor suggestions to provide some seasonally wet areas for vicinity wildlife. Maple, hackberry, oak and magnolia street trees are proposed. Double rows of red maples would be planted along frontages of both San Miguel and Francisco Avenues. Special landscape designs are included at corner lots on Francisco Avenue for. Special landscape plans have been prepared for both the 4-

EXHIBITS

*EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USE MAP*

*NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT MAP*

*SITE ANALYSIS MAP*

*AREA CIRCULATION & STREETScape PLANS*

*SITE PLAN-CONDITIONAL USE MAP*

*TENTATIVE MAPS (1, 2 & 3)*

*LANDSCAPE PLANS*

*ARCHITECTURAL PLANS*

*GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS*

*DESIGN GUIDELINES CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS*

# EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Potentially Significant Impact	Less- Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporat ion	Less- Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---	-----------

## I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Discussion:

Impact 4.3-B of the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final EIR states "patterns of new development may alter the City's existing rural character and visual qualities." The General Plan Final EIR concluded that implementation of the following General Plan policies would result in less than significant impact for degradation of visual quality and rural character from development consistent with the General Plan policies:

- LUL-E-2: As part of planning and development review activities, ensure that projects, subdivisions, and neighborhoods are designed to foster livability.
- UD-F-2: Protect natural features such as topography and mature trees, and minimize grading of natural contours, in new residential developments.

### Setting and Impacts

The site has no significant or unusual scenic vistas, being within the urban development area of the Santa Rosa General Plan 2020. The east-west section of Francisco Avenue to the north of Kerry Ranch that is designated a scenic roadway is not visible from any of the three properties comprising Kerry Ranch. The three properties were historically developed as small agricultural and rural residential sites. Remnants of prior improvements and mostly exotic tree plantings occur on the site.

The site improvements and the off-site improvements of San Miguel and Francisco Avenues would result in the removal of trees as documented in the Horticultural Associates Tree Preservation and Mitigation Reports for Kerry Ranch 1, 2 and 3. The project would result in the removal of all exotic 46 red gum Eucalyptus trees on Kerry Ranch 1, the 141 mostly exotic trees on Kerry Ranch 2, and the 28 mostly exotic trees on Kerry Ranch 3. Horticultural Associates recommended removal of all trees on the Kerry Ranch 1 and 2 sites due to hazardous structure and poor existing health of all the trees. Horticultural Associates recommended none of the trees on the Kerry Ranch 3 site for preservation, mostly due to tree conflicts with the proposed subdivision layout. No heritage native trees were identified for preservation. Ample street and yard tree plantings will replace removed trees on the Kerry Ranch site. The applicant has also offered to plant additional street trees on the east side of

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non – attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The City of Santa Rosa participates with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to address improvements of air quality. The Pacific Ocean dominates the climate of Sonoma County as the summer winds blow confaminants south toward San Francisco and in the winter periods of stagnant air can occur, especially between storms. Air Quality in Santa Rosa has generally improved as motor vehicles have become cleaner, agricultural and residential burning has been curtailed, and consumer products have been reformulated or replaced.

Sonoma County is in attainment of federal standards and in compliance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The United States Environmental Protection Agency requires that air basins record no more than three exceedances of ozone at a single station, over a three-year period (no more than one exceedance per year, on average). Stations that record four or more exceedances in three years cause the region to violate the standard. According to the BAAQMD, pollutant monitoring results for the years 1996 to 2001 at the Santa Rosa ambient air quality monitoring station indicate that air quality in the project area has generally been good.

Construction-related emissions from the project could cause temporary adverse nuisance impacts to surrounding residential uses. Fine particulate matter associated with fugitive dust is the construction pollutant of greatest concern. Construction equipment would also produce exhaust emissions. The BAAQMD approved standard dust control practices would be required. Dust generated by construction activities will be mitigated through application of standard construction-control-measures-of-the-City-Code-and-conditioning-of-the-project-with-those requirements.

The Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final EIR concludes that implementation of the many cited General Plan policies on pages 4-128 to 130 will minimize degradation of ambient air quality and reduce air quality impacts to a less than significant level. No air quality impacts are peculiar to the proposed Kerry Ranch project. The project is consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan, and the General Plan Final EIR concluded that there were no significant adverse air quality impacts as a result of development consistent with the General Plan. Consistent with cited Air Quality mitigation measure and Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Policy H-C-6, many of the Kerry Ranch residences include a potential second dwelling unit.



Potentially Significant Impact	Less- Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporat ion	Less- Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---	-----------

Discussion:

The General Plan has characterized the project area as potentially containing wetlands and rare plants (vernal pool habitat). The project sponsor has hired qualified biologists to study the project sites, evaluate existing conditions, identify biotic impacts and design mitigation measures to satisfy the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB).

Setting and Impacts

A comprehensive Biological Assessment for Kerry Ranch 1, 2 and 3, dated June 2006, and revised May 29, 2007, and a later document entitled "Supporting Information, Application for a Permit to Discharge Fill into Seasonal Wetlands Roadside Ditches, Kerry Ranch Development Project" have been prepared by Dr. Ted P. Winfield, Ph.D. The Biological Assessment (BA) addresses the impacts of the Kerry Ranch residential development project on biotic resources of concern that include suitable habitat for Sonoma sunshine (*Blennosperma bakeri*), and occupied habitat for Burke's goldfields (*Lasthenia burkei*). Rare plant surveys and protocol surveys for CTS were conducted at the Kerry Ranch project site during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 survey seasons. The more recent study assessed wetlands in the ditches along and off the Kerry Ranch project so as to be sufficient for the proposed permanent sidewalk at the project site and the interim walkway segments on the west side of Francisco Avenue north to the school crossing.

The Kerry Ranch project site consists primarily of non-native annual grasslands with seasonal wetlands scattered throughout the grassland. Exotic vegetation in the form of trees (primarily eucalyptus) and ornamental shrubs occur in association with an existing residence (Kerry Ranch 3) or in the vicinity of previously-demolished residences and other buildings (Kerry Ranch 2). Although the area likely supported vernal pools in the past, activities, such as disking and land leveling have altered the land and its topography and disturbed the pre-existing vernal pools and contributing watersheds. While there are still some areas that sustain ponding for an extended duration (several months), past disturbances have substantially impacted the plant communities found in these ponded areas.

Biological resource surveys have been conducted at the Kerry Ranch project site, including delineation of wetlands and other waters of the United States, special-status plant species surveys and protocol surveys for the CTS. The Kerry Ranch lands support a combined total of approximately 2.26 acres of wetlands and 0.04 acre of roadside ditches subject to the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and State Water Resources Control Board - 0.76 acre of wetlands and 0.03 acre of roadside ditches at Kerry Ranch 1; 0.71 acre of wetlands and 0.013 acre of roadside ditches at Kerry Ranch 2; and 0.79 acre of wetlands and 0.003 acre of roadside ditches at Kerry Ranch 3. Protocol surveys for CTS were conducted in 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 with negative findings.

The design of the extended detention basin has been modified to incorporate two depressional features outside the low-flow channel in the basin bottom, which will retain water as the basin drains and mimic seasonal "wetlands." These "wetland" features will be constructed by over excavation of the basin bottom at two locations, creating an artificial water-restricting by compacting one foot of clay in the bottom of the excavated depressional area, and placing 0.5 to 0.8 foot of loam soil on top of the compacted clay. The side slopes will be as gentle as possible, as dictated by surrounding conditions in the bottom of the basin. These "wetlands" will then be inoculated using stockpiled surface soil material collected from the existing seasonal wetland located in the southwest corner of Kerry Ranch 1. The stockpiled surface soil will contain seed of the plant species currently present in the seasonal wetland. The stockpiled seeds will also be spread on the remainder of the basin bottom.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project site is located in an urban area and has historical agricultural (grazing) and residential uses which resulted in site disturbance, minimizing any potential for presence of historical/cultural and archaeological resources. There are no unique geological or paleontological features on the project site.

The Kerry Ranch applicant had archaeological and historical reports prepared for the project, consistent with General Plan 2020 Policy HP-A-1: "Review proposed developments and work in conjunction with Sonoma State University's Northwest Information center to determine whether sites contain known Native American resources or have the potential for such resources."

Setting and Impacts

ASI Archaeology and Cultural Resources Management prepared reports for each of the Kerry Ranch sites. All reports concluded that there were no significant archaeological resources. Likewise, the three reports prepared by Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc., for Kerry 1, 2 and 3 concluded that there were no historic resources to evaluate on the Kerry 1 and 2 sites. For the Kerry 3 property, the subject report concluded that the former Calvin and Gladys Tabor Poultry Farmstead is not eligible for inclusion in the California Register, National Register, or local listing or designation.

Mitigation Measures

A standard City condition of approval requires compliance with ASI recommendations that "In the event that any remains of prehistoric or historic human activities are encountered during project-related activities, work in the immediate vicinity of the finds shall halt and the contractor shall immediately notify the project superintendent and the City of Santa Rosa liaison. Work shall not resume until a qualified archaeologist or historic archaeologist, as appropriate, approved by the City of Santa Rosa, has evaluated the situation and made recommendations for treatment of the resource, which recommendations are carried out. If human burials are encountered, the contractor must also contact the County Coroner" and "if human remains are found, the stipulations presented in Sections 5097.54 and 507.98 of the Public Resources Code shall be followed."

(Sources: Cite source numbers):

1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most

Potentially Significant Impact	Less- Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporat ion	Less- Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---	-----------

**Mitigation Measures:**

VI. A The Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan Final EIR mitigation measures for Geology and Seismicity impacts 4.11-A and 4.11-B that reduce erosion and seismic risk to insignificant levels and are routinely required as conditions of approval by the City for new development.

VI. B The specific recommendations of the two Kleinfelder and ENGEO reports are also included as mitigation measures to be incorporated into project conditions of approval.

*(Sources: Cite source numbers)  
1, 4, 18, 19 and 20.*

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

or siltation on- or off- site?

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

The project will be served by City water and wastewater services. Storm drainage improvement will be constructed to connect site drainage to City systems. The project site is not located in a 100-year floodplain.

As a result of there being swales that seasonally pond water on the Kerry Ranch sites and adjacent and nearby ditches along the street frontages, the applicant has employed qualified biologists to evaluate the property for the occurrence of wetlands subject to State or Federal jurisdiction and for any related or other significant biotic resources. The applicant and the project team have consulted with staff of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).

**Setting and Impacts**

The Kerry Ranch 1 site is relatively flat. The elevation drop across the property ranges from the northeast to southwest corner and is a little more than one foot. The topography is characterized by mounds and depressional swales but is, nonetheless, relatively flat with little overall slope. Elevations in the upland portions of all the property vary by less than two feet. The natural drainage pattern has been substantially modified.

The Kerry Ranch 2 project site is relatively flat. The site slopes generally to the west but the total elevation drop is generally less than two feet. Remnants of the natural micro-topography are present primarily in the western half of

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan designates the entire project site Low Density Residential (2-8 DU/acre), which was evaluated in the General Plan certified Final EIR. The General Plan also contains language in its Housing Element encouraging second units. Policy H-C-7 on page 4-72 of the General Plan states: "Promote development of second units."

The application proposes rezoning of the property from its OSC designation to R-1-6 to support the planned residential subdivision. The site was rezoned to the IOS (Interim Open Space) District and annexed to the City in 2000. The IOS District was an interim zoning district applied at the time of annexation with the purpose of recognizing that the property may contain environmental resources such as wetlands and rare plants. The IOS District essentially restricted development pending the disclosure and adequate protection of natural resources or until such time as resource agency clearance could be obtained. It was recognized that properties may rezone to be consistent with the underlying Residential, Low Density General Plan land use designation should natural resources not be discovered or should clearance from resource agencies be granted.

**Setting and Impacts**

The proposed residential project is consistent with the General Plan, which designates the site Low Density Residential. The proposed rezoning action would remove the OSC designation (which identifies the potential presence of rare plants and natural resources) to R-1-6. The R-1-6 zone would be consistent with the range of other residential subdivisions in the area, while the presence of seasonal wetlands (0.71 acre, per the wetlands delineation study) is limited. Applicable General Plan policies include:

*Section 2.4, Low Density Land Use Designation: Development is intended for single-family residential dwellings, with a density range of 2-8 units/gross acre.*

*LUL-E-2: As part of planning and development review activities, ensure that projects, subdivisions, and neighborhoods are designed to foster livability. (This includes use of different housing types and locations to accommodate a diverse range of needs, and use of quiet, interconnected neighborhood streets to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.)*

*LUL-F-1: Do not allow development at less than the minimum density prescribed by each residential land use classification.*

*LUL-F-3: Maintain a balance of various housing types in each neighborhood and ensure that new development does not result in undue concentration of a single housing type in any one neighborhood.*

Potentially Significant Impact	Less- Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less- Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---	-----------

Mitigation Measures  
None.

(Sources: Cite source numbers)

1.

## XI. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Discussion:

Residential uses do not typically generate substantial sources of noise. There are no major sources of noise generation near the project site. The project would result in short term noise impacts related to construction of the proposed residential units.

The Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final EIR found that with implementation of all mitigation measures therein, ambient noise levels along highways and roadways within the City would increase to less than significant levels.

### Setting and Impacts

Neither San Miguel nor Francisco Avenues are streets with traffic levels high enough now or in the future to cause increased noise levels requiring special noise mitigation for new adjacent development.

The project will result in short-term noise impacts related to site grading and construction activities. Standard City conditions of project approval limit the hours of construction to 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and

Potentially Significant Impact	Less- Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporat ion	Less- Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---	-----------

### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- |                             |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Fire protection?         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools?                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Parks?                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The project site is located within the City of Santa Rosa and would receive all necessary public services.

The City Council considers the appropriate levels of service and allocates funding to provide these services through the annual review of the City budget. Recently, some projects have been conditioned with additional requirements in areas underserved by fire, police and/or emergency services and facilities. At the time of project application, such considerations had not been made for the Kerry Ranch area.

Fire protection services will be provided by the City of Santa Rosa. The Fire Department will impose conditions of, including provision of a fire flow analysis to ensure adequate water pressure and flow rates. Police protection services will be provided by the City Police Department, who will impose conditions regarding use of security night lighting and construction security. Evidence of school impact fees would be made to the applicable school district offices (grades K-6 by the Piner-Olivet Union School District, and Santa Rosa City Schools for grades 7-12) prior to City issuance of any building permits. Parks impacts would be addressed through payment of City impact fees. Electrical and gas facilities would be constructed by the project developer, with service provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

**Setting and Impacts**

Refer to General Plan 2020 Final EIR.

**Mitigation Measures**

None.

*(Sources: Cite source numbers)*

1 and 4.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less- Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporat ion	Less- Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---	-----------

agency for designated roads or highways?

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

W-Trans prepared a Traffic Impact Study dated June 29, 2007, for all three phases of Kerry Ranch development. The traffic study was completed in accordance with previous analyses for the City of Santa Rosa and standard traffic engineering techniques and standard criteria.

Setting and Impacts

The W-Trans Traffic Impact Study assumed full build-out of all three phases of the Kerry Ranch project, including all of the second units. The Study evaluated the project area with special emphasis on local intersections as required by City staff. Additionally, levels of service on the roadway segments of Fulton Road from San Miguel Avenue to Piner Road and of Piner Road from Fulton Road to Marlow Road were analyzed. Weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours were chosen for analysis.

The Study found that the Kerry Ranch project as proposed is consistent with the City's previous General Plan traffic analyses. Planned improvements in the study area will address existing level of service deficiencies, and the City will need to reserve right-of-way at Fulton Road/Piner Road for turn lanes to address the projected LOS E conditions there.

The Kerry Ranch project as a whole is expected to generate approximately 1,185 new daily trips, including 94 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 121 trips during the p.m. peak hour assuming that all potential second units are occupied and generate trips in a manner consistent with apartments. The Report found that the project is expected to have less-than-significant impacts on all studied intersection and roadway levels of service. Additionally, the Report concludes that the Kerry Ranch sites' circulation system is expected to operate acceptably.

For traffic calming, Kerry Ranch will include one raised intersection along Francisco Avenue as recommended by staff and in response to the Planning Commission's earlier request for traffic calming in the Kerry Ranch vicinity. Kerry Ranch home designs along Francisco Avenue would include front doors, porches and landscaped front yards to add to the Francisco Avenue traffic calming with such front-on lots.

Neighborhood interest in pedestrian, bicycle and school circulation has led to the applicant and City staff considering various options for achieving such circulation elements. The Kerry Ranch applicant proposes that the



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project will be served by City water and sewer services; adequate water supplies and wastewater treatment plant capacity are available for the project. Existing wells and septic systems on the project site will be required to be abandoned, consistent with City and County Environmental Health standards. New storm drainage facilities will be required to accommodate runoff from the proposed project; standard City conditions will require compliance with the Storm Water Mitigation Plan Guidelines, use of best management practices and submittal of storm drainage plans to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Adequate landfill capacity exists at County facilities to support the project.

Setting and Impacts

Refer to General Plan 2020 Final EIR for cumulative impact assessments. The proposed storm water drainage pond included within the Kerry Ranch 1 site that would serve all Kerry Ranch phases would not result in adverse impacts as documented in the Biological Resources and Water Quality and Hydrology sections above.

Mitigation Measures

None.

*(Sources: Cite source numbers)*

1, 8, 9 and 10.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less- Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporat ion	Less- Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---	-----------

addressed by ongoing City efforts to pursue alternative transportation modes, including increased use of public transit and other Transportation Systems Management methods.

No impacts or changes other than those already assessed in the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan Final EIR have been identified. The Kerry Ranch project is consistent with the development density designation of the General Plan and qualifies for consideration under Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines. Those sections do not require and, in fact, preclude further environmental review other than that related to effects that:

- are peculiar to the project or site;
- are not analyzed as significant in the prior General Plan Final EIR;
- are potential significant off-site or cumulative impacts not discussed in the General Plan EIR; or
- are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the General Plan EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severer adverse impact than discussed in the prior General Plan EIR.

For Kerry Ranch, the above Initial Study has found no significant impacts or changes peculiar to the project or site that cannot be mitigated to levels less than significant. Refer specifically to the Biological Resources and Hydrology/Water Quality sections above. All other potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts or changes have been assessed in the prior Final EIR for the General Plan 2020. No other or different significant and unavoidable impacts or changes not discussed in the General Plan 2020 Final EIR have been identified for development in the northwest area of Santa Rosa.

**Mitigation Measures**

None.

*(Sources: Cite source numbers)*

1.

c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion:

No project effects were found in the Initial Study above that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Non-project specific cumulative effects analysis is included in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final EIR.

**Setting and Impacts**

N/A.

**Mitigation Measures**

None.

*(Sources: Cite source numbers)*

All.

18. "Geotechnical Investigation Report Proposed Kerry Ranch Subdivision" (Kerry I) by Kleinfelder, dated May 18, 2005
19. "Geotechnical Investigation Report Kerry Ranch II Subdivision, 2191 Francisco Ave." by Kleinfelder, dated 9/21/05
20. "Geotechnical Exploration Kerry Ranch III" by ENGEO, dated 7/7/06
21. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 2245 San Miguel Avenue" (Kerry I) by Kleinfelder, dated 11/4/04
22. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 2191 Francisco Avenue" (Kerry II) by Kleinfelder, dated 12/22/04
23. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 2193 Francisco Avenue" (Kerry III) by Kleinfelder, dated 3/16/06
24. "Preliminary Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Kerry Ranch Subdivision", by Civil Design Consultants, Inc., dated 11/06
25. "Traffic Impact Study for Kerry Ranch (Phases 1, 2 and 3), by W-Trans, dated 6/29/07

### PROJECT SPONSOR'S INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

As the project sponsor or the authorized agent of the project sponsor, I, Harvey O. Rich, undersigned, have reviewed the Initial Study for the Kerry Ranch project and have particularly reviewed all mitigation measures and monitoring programs identified herein. I accept the findings of the Initial Study and mitigation measures and hereby agree to modify the proposed project applications now on file with the City of Santa Rosa to include and incorporate all mitigation measures and monitoring programs set out in this Initial Study.

KERRY RANCH LLC 9/6/07

Property Owner (authorized agent) Date

By HARVEY O. RICH  
MANAGING MEMBER